Attorney Docket No. 000418US U.S. Patent Application No. 09/778,635 Reply to Final Office Action dated: February 17, 2005

RCE and Amendment and Request for Reconsideration dated: March 24, 2005

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments to Claims

Independent Claims 1, 11, 21, and 26 have been amended to recite sanitizing to remove bibliographic information. This recitation is supported by the specification. For example, page 7, lines 18 and 19 define "sanitize" and page 12, lines 3-5 describe a bibliographic filter to remove bibliographic information.

The Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by BountyQuest. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

A. Claims 1-4 and 6-10.

BountyQuest does not teach sanitizing said substantive information to remove bibliographic information.

BountyQuest does not teach the amended Claim 1 element of: "sanitizing said substantive information to remove <u>bibliographic</u> information." Bibliographic information is defined on page 7 of the specification as: "The description, identification and source of the editions, dates of issue, authorship, and typography of books, articles, or other written material." This definition is congruent with the accepted definition of this term. For example, the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines bibliographic as: "1: the history, identification, or description of writings or publications. 2 a: a list often with descriptive or critical notes of writings relating to a particular subject, period, or author b: a list of works written by an author or printed by a publishing house 3: the works or a list of the works referred to in a text or consulted by the author in its production." BountyQuest only teaches the removal of the bounty hunter's name. For example, the Examiner cited page 17 of BountyQuest and stated: "When BountyQuest receives information, it filters the data and keeps bounty hunters anonymous." The first full paragraph on page 17 states: "You will remain anonymous by default..." BountyQuest is silent regarding the

Attorney Docket No. 000418US U.S. Patent Application No. 09/778,635

Reply to Final Office Action dated: February 17, 2005

Reply to Final Office Action dated: February 17, 2005 RCE and Amendment and Request for Reconsideration dated: March 24, 2005

removal of <u>bibliographic</u> information. That is, BountyQuest does not manipulate the actual substantive information. Keeping a bounty hunter anonymous and removing bibliographic information are unrelated and completely different. BountyQuest also does not suggest or motivate removing bibliographic information.

BountyQuest does not teach all the elements of Claim 1. Therefore, BountyQuest does not anticipate Claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-10 depend from Claim 1 and also are patentable over the prior art reference. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be removed

B. Claims 11-14 and 16-30.

The Examiner stated that Claims 11-14 and 16-30 recite substantially similar limitations to Claims 1-4 and 6-10 and are therefore rejected on the same basis as Claims 1-4 and 6-10.

Independent Claim 11 has been amended to recite: "sanitizing said published information to remove bibliographic information."

Independent Claim 21 has been amended to recite: "means for sanitizing said substantive information to remove bibliographic information."

Independent Claim 26 has been amended to recite: "means for sanitizing said published information to remove bibliographic information."

Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments regarding Claim 1 are applicable to Claims 11, 21 and 26 and therefore BountyQuest does not anticipate Claims 11, 21, and 26. Claims 12-14 and 16-20 depend from Claim 11 and also are patentable over the cited prior art reference. Claims 22-25 depend from Claim 21 and also are patentable over the cited prior art reference. Claims 27-30 depend from Claim 26 and also are patentable over the prior art reference. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be removed.

Attorney Docket No. 000418US U.S. Patent Application No. 09/778,635 Reply to Final Office Action dated: February 17, 2005 RCE and Amendment and Request for Reconsideration dated: March 24, 2005

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Paul Maliszewski, P.E. Registration No. 51,990 CUSTOMER NO. 24041

Simpson & Simpson, PLLC

5555 Main Street

Williamsville, NY 14221-5406

Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM

Dated: March 24, 2005